



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,292	09/12/2003	Harrison Robert Murphy	2138.001B	7437

23405 7590 10/06/2004

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC  
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE  
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER
----------

CONLEY, FREDRICK C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3673

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,292

Applicant(s)

MURPHY ET AL.

Examiner

Fredrick C Conley

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-6, 19-22, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,504,991 to Klancnik in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,762,750 to Girgis et al.

Claim 1, Klancnik discloses an open flame resistant mattress comprising a fire barrier fabric at least partially enclosing a core 75 of said mattress, said fire barrier fabric comprising a fire barrier layer 22 of neoprene foam and backing 24 of fiberglass and a thermally insulating layer 26. With regards to the fire barrier layer and thermally insulating layer independently comprising at least one char-forming flame-retardant fiber, Applicant discloses in the specification that fiberglass is a char forming flame resistant material. Therefore, combo-layer 22/24 meets the limitations of char-forming flame retardant fiber. Klancnik fails to disclose the fire barrier fabric comprising a textile. Girgis discloses fibers strands and yarns used in textile applications (col. 1 lines 14-46). It would have been obvious to employ the applications as taught by Girgis in order to improve the fibers used in the mattress of Klancnik while taking advantage of the non-flamability and stability.

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 4, Klancnik discloses a method for reducing flammability of an article comprising filling materials, said method comprising at least partially enclosing the filling materials with a fire barrier fabric comprising a fire barrier layer 22 of neoprene foam and backing 24 of fiberglass and a thermally insulating layer 26. With regards to the fire barrier layer and thermally insulating layer independently comprising at least one char-forming flame-retardant fiber, Applicant discloses in the specification that fiberglass is a char forming flame resistant material. Therefore, combo-layer 22/24 meets the limitations of char-forming flame retardant fiber. Klancnik fails to disclose the fire barrier fabric comprising a textile. Girgis discloses fibers strands and yarns used in textile applications (col. 1 lines 14-46). It would have been obvious to employ the applications as taught by Girgis in order to improve the fibers used in the mattress of Klancnik while taking advantage of the non-flamability and stability.

Claims 5-6, wherein said article is a mattress.

Claim 19, Klancnik discloses a flame-retardant composite fire barrier fabric comprising a thermally insulating layer 26 and a fire barrier layer 22 of neoprene foam and backing 24 of fiberglass. With regards to the fire barrier layer and thermally insulating layer independently comprising at least one char-forming flame-retardant fiber, Applicant discloses in the specification that fiberglass is a char forming flame resistant material. Therefore, combo-layer 22/24 meets the limitations of char-forming flame retardant fiber. Klancnik fails to disclose the fire barrier fabric comprising a textile. Girgis discloses fibers strands and yarns used in textile applications (col. 1 lines 14-46). It would have been obvious to employ the applications as taught by Girgis in order to

Art Unit: 3673

improve the fibers used in the mattress of Klancnik while taking advantage of the non-flamability and stability.

Claim 20, wherein at least one of said fire barrier layer and said thermally insulating layer comprises at least one structure providing char-forming flame-retardant fiber.

Claims 21-22 and 25, wherein said at least one flame-retardant fiber is fiberglass.

Claim 27, wherein the fire barrier fabric at least partially encloses the filling materials (fig. 4).

Claims 2, 7, 23-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,504,991 to Klancnik in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,762,750 to Girgis et al., and U.S. Pat. No. 6,410,140 to Land et al.

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Klancnik discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the mattress resisting an open flame under conditions of a full-scale open flame test. Land discloses a material fabricated for a mattress to resist an open flame under conditions of a full-scale open flame test (col. 7-8 lines 65-68 & 1-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the material as taught by Land with the mattress of Klancnik in order to provide a fire resistant fabric having a feel and surface characteristic of upholstered fabrics.

Claim 23-24 and 26, Klancnik discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the at least one flame-retardant fiber comprising para-aramid fibers and a

Art Unit: 3673

blend of flame-retardant viscose and modacrylic fibers. Land discloses one flame-retardant fiber comprising para-aramid fibers (col. 4 lines 46-47)(col. 5 lines 24-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the material as taught by Land with the mattress of Klancnick in order to provide a fire resistant fabric having a feel and surface characteristic of upholstered fabrics.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 3 and 28 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3673

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fredrick C Conley whose telephone number is 308-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on m-th m-fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FC



  
MICHAEL F. TRETTEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 358